

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (CPAR)
INCOMPLETE-FINALIZED

Construction

Name/Address of Contractor:

Company Name: [REDACTED]

Division Name:

Street Address: [REDACTED]

City: [REDACTED]

State/Province: [REDACTED]

Country: USA

CAGE Code:

DUNS Number: [REDACTED]

PSC: [REDACTED] NAICS Code: [REDACTED]

Evaluation Type: Final

Contract Percent Complete: 100

Period of Performance Being Assessed: [REDACTED]

Contract Number: [REDACTED] Business Sector & Sub-Sector: Construction

Contracting Office: W074 ENDIST JACKSNVLLLE Contracting Officer: [REDACTED]

Location of Work:

Award Date: [REDACTED] Effective Date: [REDACTED]

Completion Date: [REDACTED] Estimated/Actual Completion Date: [REDACTED]

Total Dollar Value: [REDACTED] Current Contract Dollar Value: [REDACTED]

Complexity: Medium Termination Type: None

Competition Type: Full and Open Competition after Exclusion of Sources Contract Type: Firm Fixed Price

Key Subcontractors and Effort Performed:

DUNS:

Effort:

DUNS:

Effort:

DUNS:

Effort:

Project Number: [REDACTED]

Project Title:

Contract Effort Description:

Small Business Utilization:

Does this contract include a subcontracting plan? No

Date of last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR)/ Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR): N/A

Evaluation Areas

Past Rating

Rating

Quality: [REDACTED]

N/A

Very Good

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

(1) SAFETY: Very Good

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Variance (Contract to Date):

Current Cost Variance (%): 0 Variance at Completion (%): 0

Current Schedule Variance (%): 0

Assessing Official Comments:

QUALITY: VG

EXAMPLES:

[REDACTED]

(2) The Contractor displayed very good coordination efforts with the USCG Aids to Navigation office in regard to nav aid relocations and kept the USACE field office informed of status of nav aids movements. The Contractor also coordinated well with the USCG 7th District to inform mariners in the area of his operations throughout the project. The Contractor also coordinated well with the local governments to conduct his activities in unison with several local large scale public functions in the [REDACTED] area. The Contractor also coordinated well with the local county park personnel and performed his construction activities in and near the busy county park at the dredging site without any incident.

(3) The Contractor worked well with the local sea turtle nest monitoring personnel and [REDACTED] to conduct his equipment and operations near the beaches in the middle of the critical portion of the sea turtle and shorebird nesting seasons. The Contractor adapted his equipment to the extent possible to complete the project with no impacts to sea turtle or shorebird nesting activities near the project.

[REDACTED]
The Contractor conducted his offshore dredging and near shore placement operations in these busy environments without any incident which is noteworthy.

Supporting Situations/Documentation for below:

a. Quality of Workmanship – VG – Maintenance dredging, nearshore placement operations and all associated environmental monitoring activities were performed very well with no significant deficiencies. The quality of workmanship was noted based on completion of all dredging acceptance sections with the first pass and no follow-up post-dredge surveys were required. The nearshore placement operations were difficult to accomplish but were performed very well and improved as the project progressed.

b. Adequacy of the CQC Plan – VG – The QC plan was completely adequate and deficiencies in the plan were not noted throughout performance of the work.

c. Implementation of the CQC Plan – VG – Implementation of the QC Plan was very good with no significant deficiencies noted during all phases of the work

d. Quality of QC Documentation –VG– Quality of daily reporting was very good. The QC Manager’s documentation of quality control issues as they arose and resolutions was very good.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[REDACTED]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

g. Adequacy of Submittals – VG – Submittals were very good and always submitted in a timely manner. Questions raised to the Contractor regarding any details of a submittal were always answered in cooperative and prompt fashion.

h. Adequacy of Testing – VG – Turbidity testing to meet the project water quality certification was the only significant testing performed. The testing was well performed and the reports consistently met contract and permit requirements.

[REDACTED]

k. Identification/Correction of deficient work in a timely manner- VG – Deficient work was not common during the project but any minor deficiencies which were noted were attended to by the Contractor's staff in a very timely manner.

[REDACTED]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[REDACTED]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

[REDACTED]

- a. Compliance with Safety Standards: - VG– The Contractor’s management was very active in enforcing compliance with the safety standards. This resulted in no safety/health related accidents throughout the project.
- b. Adequacy of Safety Plan –VG – The Safety Plan proved to be very effective in that there were zero accidents at the work site over the two month construction period.
- c. Implementation of Safety Plan – VG - The Safety Plan implementation was very effective which resulted in no accidents occurring throughout the project.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[REDACTED]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

d. Correction of Noted Deficiencies – VG – Any noted deficiencies were relatively minor and resolved in a very timely manner throughout the two month construction period.

e. Quantitative evaluation of accidents and injuries – VG – There were no lost-time accidents or injuries during the two month construction period.

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: The Contractor deserves congratulations for his high level of performance in all evaluation elements. The Contractor's management and workforce are commended for their cooperation and ability to fully meet and often exceed the technical and administrative requirements of this contract.

RECOMMENDATION:

Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to perform in accordance with this contract or order's most significant requirements, I would recommend them for similar requirements in the future.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Review by Reviewing Official:

Great job by all personnel involved in this successful project.

[Redacted]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Redacted]